

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

TEXAS ASSOCIATION FOR MONEY SERVICES BUSINESSES (TAMSB); HIGH VALUE, INC.; REYNOSA CASA DE CAMBIO, INC.; NYDIA REGALADO d/b/a BEST RATE EXCHANGE; MARIO REGALADO d/b/a BORDER INTERNATIONAL SERVICES; LAREDO INSURANCE SERVICES, LLC; E.MEX. FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC.; R & C, INC. d/b/a TEMEX MONEY EXCHANGE; SAN ISIDRO MULTI SERVICES, INC.; CRIS WIN INC. d/b/a BROWNSVILLE CASA DE CAMBIO; ESPRO INVESTMENT LLC d/b/a LONESTAR MONEY EXCHANGE; and ARNOLDO GONZALEZ, Jr.,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

PAM BONDI, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES; SCOTT BESSANT, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY; ANDREA GACKI, DIRECTOR OF THE FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK; and FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK,

*Defendants.*

Civil Case No. 5:25-cv-00344-FB

---

**JOINT SCHEDULING RECOMMENDATION**

---

Pursuant to the Court's Order of June 11, 2025, the parties recommend that the following deadlines be entered in the scheduling order to control the course of this case:

1. The parties have conferred and jointly request that they be excused from the obligation to complete ADR under Local Rule CV-88. Plaintiffs in this case challenge the

lawfulness of an agency action that applies to money services businesses across thirty zip codes, and, in response, Defendants maintain that the challenged agency action is lawful. These claims are not susceptible to voluntary resolution. The parties request that no deadline for ADR be set.

2. For the same reason, the parties do not think that written offers of settlement would be helpful and ask the Court not to set any deadline for such offers.

3. The parties do not anticipate any further amendments to the pleadings. To the extent that a deadline is required, the parties suggest that any motion to amend or supplement the pleadings should be due by August 6, 2025.

4. Because this case is a challenge to agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act, the parties do not anticipate calling any experts. The parties do not believe deadlines for expert disclosure are necessary for this litigation.

5. For the same reason, the parties do not think it is necessary to set a deadline for objections to expert testimony.

6. Because this case is a challenge to agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act, the parties believe that it should be decided on the basis of the administrative record without any need for discovery.<sup>1</sup> The parties therefore do not believe that it is necessary to set a deadline for the close of discovery.

7. Defendants have moved to stay this litigation pending the appeal from the preliminary injunction, and Plaintiffs oppose the motion to stay. To the extent that the litigation is not stayed, the parties jointly suggest the following schedule for dispositive motions:

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties disagree about what materials are properly within the administrative record. Plaintiffs moved to supplement the administrative record, *see* Doc. 50, and the Court granted that motion, *see* Doc. 54. Defendants preserve their objection to the motion to supplement the record and intend to argue that supplementation is unwarranted at summary judgment as well. Plaintiffs continue to maintain that the motion was properly granted.

August 6	Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment
September 12	Defendants' Response and Cross-MSJ/MTD
October 13	Plaintiffs' Response and Reply
November 3	Defendants' Reply

The parties further agree that there is no need for an answer at this stage, given Defendants' intention to file a Motion to Dismiss or for Summary Judgment, and propose that regardless of whether this matter is stayed, any obligation to answer the Complaint be held in abeyance at this time.

8. Because this case is a challenge to agency action under the Administrative Procedure Act, the parties believe that it is appropriately decided on the basis of the administrative record on cross-motions for summary judgment. *See, e.g., Amin v. Mayorkas*, 24 F.4th 383, 391 (5th Cir. 2022). The parties therefore do not believe that it is necessary to set a deadline for trial. However, the parties do believe it would be appropriate to set a hearing date for oral argument after briefing is concluded.

9. All of the parties who have appeared in the action conferred concerning the contents of the proposed scheduling order on July 9, 2025, and the parties have agreed as to its contents.

Dated: July 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Golando  
The Law Office of Martin Golando, PLLC  
Texas Bar No. 24059153  
2326 W. Magnolia  
San Antonio, Texas 78201  
Office: (210) 471-1185  
Email: martin.golando@gmail.com

Roland Gutierrez  
The Law Office of Roland Gutierrez

/s/ Robert E. Johnson  
Jeffrey Rowes (TX Bar No. 24104956)\*  
Christen Mason Hebert (TX Bar No. 24099898)  
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE  
816 Congress Ave., Suite 970  
Austin, TX 78701  
(512) 480-5936  
jrowes@ij.org  
chebert@ij.org

Robert E. Johnson (DC Bar No. 1013390)\*  
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

SBN #: 24007291  
104 Babcock Ste. 107  
San Antonio, Texas 78201  
(210) 225-7114

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Texas Association for Money Services Businesses (TAMSB); Reynosa Casa De Cambio, Inc.; Nydia Regalado d/b/a Best Rate Exchange; Mario Regalado d/b/a Border International Services; Laredo Insurance Services, LLC; E.Mex. Financial Services, Inc.; R & C, Inc. d/b/a Temex Money Exchange; San Isidro Multi Services, Inc.; Cris Win Inc. d/b/a Brownsville Casa De Cambio; and Espro Investment LLC d/b/a Lonestar Money Exchange*

16781 Chagrin Blvd., Suite 256  
Shaker Heights, OH 44120  
(703) 682-9320  
rjohnson@ij.org

Elizabeth L. Sanz (CA Bar No. 340538)\*  
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE  
901 N. Glebe Road, Suite 900  
Arlington, VA 22203  
(703) 682-9320  
bsanz@ij.org

Katrin Marquez (FL Bar No. 1024765)\*  
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE  
2 South Biscayne Blvd., Suite 3180  
Miami, FL 33131  
(305) 721-1600  
kmarquez@ij.org

\* Admitted *pro hac vice*

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Arnoldo Gonzalez, Jr. and High Value, Inc.*

BRETT SHUMATE  
Assistant Attorney General

STEPHEN M. ELLIOTT  
Assistant Director, Federal Programs Branch

/s/ Amy E. Powell  
AMY E. POWELL  
Senior Trial Counsel  
United States Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
c/o U.S. Attorney's Office for EDNC  
150 Fayetteville St, Suite 2100  
Raleigh, NC 27601  
Tel.: 919-856-4013  
Email: [amy.powell@usdoj.gov](mailto:amy.powell@usdoj.gov)

*Counsel for Defendants*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on July 11, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will provide electronic service upon all attorneys of record.

/s/ Robert E. Johnson